

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA VALDOSTA DIVISION

UNITED MIDDLE	FEE STAT E DIS	FES C	Qu HSTB	012 ICT COURT GEORGIA

T	HE	B	&	F	S	S	ΓΕΜ,	INC.	
---	----	---	---	---	---	---	------	------	--

Plaintiff,

٧.

LLOYD J. LEBLANC JR., MAXAM WHOLESALE OF ATLANTA, INC., DIRECT SOURCE IMPORTS, INC., ARTHUR JEFFREY LEBLANC, LLOYD LEBLANC, III, PRODUCTOS MEXICANOS DON JOSE, INC., LEBLANC'S LLC, and EDNA G. LEBLANC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 7:07-CV-192 (HL)

SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - PHASE II

	BREACH OF CONTRACT
· I.	The B & F System, Inc.'s Breach of Contract Claims – Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement
1.	Do you find that B&F proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Lloyd LeBlanc breached Paragraphs 4 or E of the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	YES NO
2.	If you answered YES to Question 1, what is the amount of damages, if any, you award B&F as a result of the breach of the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	\$ 72,114
11.	The B & F System, Inc.'s Breach of Contract Claims – Service Mark License Agreement
3.	Do you find that B&F proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Lloyd LeBlanc breached Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, or 6 of the Service Mark License Agreement?
	YES NO
4.	If you answered YES to Question 3, what is the amount of damages, if any, you award B&F as a result of the breach of the Service Mark License Agreement?
	\$ 35,665

III.	Lloyd J. LeBlanc Jr.'s Breach of Contract Counterclaim – Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement
5.	Do you find that Lloyd LeBlanc proved by a preponderance of the evidence that B&F breached Paragraph 9 of the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	YES NO
6.	If you answered YES to Question of what is the amount of damages, if any, you award Lloyd LeBlanc as a result of the breach of the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	\$ <u> </u>
IV.	Lloyd J. LeBlanc Jr.'s Breach of Contract Counterclaim – Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement, as modified
7.	Did Lloyd LeBlanc prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement was modified or amended through course of dealing or course of performance, and was breached by B&F?
	YES NO
8.	If you answered YES to Question 7, what is the amount of damages, if any, you award Lloyd LeBlanc as a result of the breach of the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	\$_ <u></u>
V.	Lloyd J. LeBlanc Jr.'s Counterclaim – Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing
	If you answered YES to Question 5 or 7, please answer Question 9. If you answered NO to both Questions 5 and 7, skip to Question 11.
9.	Did Lloyd LeBlanc prove by a preponderance of the evidence that B&F breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied under the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement?
	YES NO

				amount of dama he covenant of go	
\$					
	<u>TC</u>	DRTIOUS INTE	ERFEREN	ICE	
Jose, Inc. LeBlanc ar	tortiously intend B&F establ	erfered with th	e contrac laxam Inc	ce that Productos stual relationship dependent Distrib 31, 2007?	between Lloyd
	_ YES		_ NO		
	as a result o			amount of dama ce by Productos	
<u>\$_O</u>					
tortiously ir B&F establ	nterfered with ished by the M	the contractua	al relations ident Disti	ce that Direct Sou ship between Llo ributor Agreemen	yd LeBlanc and
V	_ YES		_ NO		
award B&F	as a result of			amount of dama by Direct Sourc	
\$ <u>7500</u>	}				
interfered established	with the cont	ractual relatio e Mark Licens	nship be	nce that Edna Letween Lloyd Letentone	Blanc and B&F
	_ YES		_ NO		
				amount of dama by Edna LeBlar	
s 0					

17.	interfered with the contri	actual relationship betwee Mark License Agreement i	that Jeff LeBlanc tortiously n Lloyd LeBlanc and B&F prior to the termination of the
	YES	NO	
18.	If you answered YES to Q award B&F as a result of t	uestion 17, what is the amo	ount of damages, if any, you Jeff LeBlanc?
	\$ 35,665		
19.	interfered with the contra	actual relationship betwee • Mark License Agreement p	that Jody LeBlanc tortiously n Lloyd LeBlanc and B&F prior to the termination of the
	YES	NO	
20.	If you answered YES to Q award B&F as a result of t	uestion 19, what is the amo	ount of damages, if any, you Jody LeBlanc?
	\$_35,665 <u></u>		
21.	Jose, Inc. tortiously interi LeBlanc and B&F establish	fered with the contractual	at Productos Mexicanos Don relationship between Lloyd ense Agreement prior to the ?
	YES	NO	
22.	If you answered YES to Q award B&F as a result of Jose, Inc.?	uestion 21, what is the amo the tortious interference by	ount of damages, if any, you Productos Mexicanos Don
	\$ 35,665		
23.	tortiously interfered with the	ne contractual relationship I rvice Mark License Agreem	at Direct Source Imports, Inc. Detween Lloyd LeBlanc and ent during the time period of
	YES	NO	

∠ 4.	award B&F as a result of the tortious interference by Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	\$ 57,066
	LANHAM ACT AND RELATED STATE LAW CLAIMS
I.	The B & F System, Inc.'s Trademark Infringement Claim - MAXAM Registered Trademark
25.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Lloyd LeBlanc infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
26.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jeff LeBlanc infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
27.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jody LeBlanc infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
28.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Edna LeBlanc infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
29.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Maxam Wholesale of Atlanta, Inc. infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
30.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Direct Source Imports, Inc. infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
31.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc. infringed on B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO

32.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that LeBlanc's LLC infringed or B&F's MAXAM registered trademark?
	YES NO
II.	The B & F System, Inc.'s Trademark Infringement Claim - Lid Knob Trademark
33.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the lid knob trademark is a valid trademark?
	YES NO
	If you answered YES to Question 33, please answer Questions 34-41. If you answered NO to Question 33, skip to Question 42.
34.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Lloyd LeBlanc infringed or the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO
35.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jeff LeBlanc infringed on the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO
36.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jody LeBlanc infringed on the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO
37.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Edna LeBlanc infringed on the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO
38.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Maxam Wholesale of Atlanta, Inc. infringed on the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO
39.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Direct Source Imports, Inc. infringed on the lid knob trademark?
	YES NO

Did B&F pro Jose, Inc. in	ove by a prepo ofringed on the	nderance of the lid knob trad	ne evidence that Pro emark?	oductos Mexicanos Don
Varieties.	_ YES		NO	
Did B&F pro	ove by a prepor trademark?	nderance of th	e evidence that Le	Blanc's LLC infringed on
	_ YES		NO	
The B & F 'Maxam W	System, Inc holesale"	:.'s Common	Law Trademark	Infringement Claim -
Did B&F p Wholesale"	prove by a pr ?	reponderance	of the evidence	that it owns "Maxam
	_ YES		NO	
f you answ	ered NO to Qเ	iestion 42, ple	ease answer Ques ase skip to Questi	on 52.
valid traden	ove by a prepo nark?	onderance of t	he evidence that " I	Maxam Wholesale" is a
Variation .	_ YES		NO	
f you answ f you answ	ered YES to Q ered NO to Qเ	uestion 43, pl estion 43, ski	ease answer Ques p to Question 52.	tions 44-51.
)id B&F pro 3&F's "Max	ove by a prepor am Wholesale	nderance of th " trademark?	e evidence that Llo	yd LeBlanc infringed on
- Walter	_ YES		NO	
Did B&F pro 3&F's "Max	ove by a prepo am Wholesale	nderance of that trademark?	ne evidence that Je	eff LeBlanc infringed on
Land Control of the C	_ YES		NO	
Did B&F pro B&F's "Max	ve by a prepor am Wholesale	nderance of th " trademark?	e evidence that Jod	dy LeBlanc infringed on
	YES		NO	

47.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Edna LeBla B&F's "Maxam Wholesale" trademark?	anc infringed on
	YES NO	
48.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Maxan Atlanta, Inc. infringed on B&F's "Maxam Wholesale" trademark?	n Wholesale of
	YES NO	
49.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Direct Sour infringed on B&F's "Maxam Wholesale" trademark?	ce Imports, Inc.
	YES NO	
50.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Productos Jose, Inc. infringed on B&F's "Maxam Wholesale" trademark?	Mexicanos Don
	YES NO	
51.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that LeBlanc's LB&F's "Maxam Wholesale" trademark?	LC infringed on
	YESNO	
IV.	The B & F System, Inc.'s False Designation of Origin/Unfair Com	petition Claim
52.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false origin/unfair competition as to Lloyd LeBlanc?	designation of
	YES NO	
53.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false origin/unfair competition as to Jeff LeBlanc?	designation of
	YES NO	
54.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false origin/unfair competition as to Jody LeBlanc?	designation of
	YES NO	

55.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false designation of origin/unfair competition as to Edna LeBlanc?
	YESNO
56.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false designation of origin/unfair competition as to Maxam Wholesale of Atlanta, Inc.?
	YES NO
57.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false designation of origin/unfair competition as to Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	YES NO
58.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false designation of origin/unfair competition as to Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc.?
	YES NO
59.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim of false designation of origin/unfair competition as to LeBlanc's LLC?
	YESNO
	If you answered YES to any question in Questions 25-59, please answer Questions 60-64.
	If you answered NO to every question in Questions 25-59, skip to Question 65.
30.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it suffered actual damages as a result of a violation of the Lanham Act?
	YES NO
31.	If you answered YES to Question 60, what is the amount of actual damages, if any, you award B&F on its Lanham Act claims?
	\$ 600,000
32.	Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that B&F is entitled to the liable Defendants' profits attributable to the Lanham Act violations?
	YES NO

If you answered YES to Question 62, what is the amount of the liable Defendants' profits, if any, you award B&F on its Lanham Act claims?
\$ <u>357,040</u>
Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the liable Defendants' actions were malicious, fraudulent, deliberate, or willful? The Court will deal with your finding in post-trial proceedings after you have been excused.
YES NO
The B & F System, Inc.'s Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act Claim
If you answered YES to any question regarding B&F's false designation of origin claim (Questions 52-59), you must find that B&F established its Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act claim by a preponderance of the evidence.
If you answered NO to every question regarding B&F's false designation of origin claim (Questions 52-59), you must find that B&F did not establish its Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act claim by a preponderance of the evidence.
Based on your answers to Questions 52-59, please respond YES or NO below as to B&F's Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act claim.
YES NO
If you answered YES to Question 65, has B&F proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the liable Defendants willfully engaged in the trade practice knowing it to be deceptive? The Court will deal with your finding in post-trial proceedings after you have been excused.
YES NO
The B & F System, Inc.'s Cyberpiracy Claim
Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jeff LeBlanc committed cyberpiracy in violation of the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act through his use of the domain names maxamwholesale.com and/or maxamwholesale.net during the time period of May 31, 2007 to June 4, 2011?
YES NO

	If you answered YES to Question 67, please answer Questions 68-70. If you answered NO to Question 67, skip to Question 71.
68.	What is the amount of actual damages, if any, you award B&F on the cyberpiracy claim?
	\$ 96,000
69.	What is the amount of the defendant's profits, if any, you award B&F on the cyberpiracy claim?
	\$96,000
70.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jeff LeBlanc's actions were malicious, fraudulent, deliberate, or willful? The Court will deal with your finding in post-trial proceedings after you are excused.
	YES NO
	VICARIOUS LIABILITY CLAIMS
71.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Lloyd LeBlanc, Edna LeBlanc, Jeff LeBlanc, and Jody LeBlanc engaged in a civil conspiracy?
	YES NO
72.	Did B&F prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Direct Source Imports, Inc. and Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc. engaged in a common business enterprise?
	YES NO
73.	If you found that Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc. tortiously interfered with either the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement or the Service Mark License Agreement (Questions 11 and 21), please answer the following:
	Should Jody LeBlanc be held personally liable for any torts committed by Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc.?
	YES NO

	Should Jeff LeBlanc be held personally liable for any torts committed by Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc.?
	YES NO
74.	If you found that Direct Source Imports, Inc. tortiously interfered with either the Maxam Independent Distributor Agreement or the Service Mark License Agreement (Questions 13 and 23), please answer the following:
	Should Jody LeBlanc be held personally liable for any torts committed by Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	YES NO
	Should Jeff LeBlanc be held personally liable for any torts committed by Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	YES NO
75.	If you found that Maxam Wholesale of Atlanta, Inc. is liable for trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition (Questions 29, 38, 48 and 56), please answer the following:
	Should Lloyd LeBlanc be held personally liable for any trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition committed by Maxam Wholesale of Atlanta, Inc.?
	YESNO
76.	If you found that Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc. is liable for trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition (Questions 31, 40, 50, and 58), please answer the following:
	Should Jody LeBlanc be held personally liable for any trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition committed by Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc.?
	YES NO

Case 7:07-cv-00192-HL Document 279 Filed 02/03/12 Page 13 of 13

•	Should Jeff LeBlanc be held personally liable for any trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition committed by Productos Mexicanos Don Jose, Inc.?
	YES NO
77.	If you found that Direct Source Imports, Inc. is liable for trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition (Questions 30, 39, 49, and 57), please answer the following:
	Should Jody LeBlanc be held personally liable for any trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition committed by Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	YES NO
	Should Jeff LeBlanc be held personally liable for any trademark infringement or false designation of origin/unfair competition committed by Direct Source Imports, Inc.?
	YES NO
	SO SAY WE ALL THIS day of January, 2012.
	FOREPERSON